

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KUM NAM LEE,) **NO. CV 22-02304 GW (KS)**
Plaintiff,)
v.)
PROLAND MANAGEMENT,) **ORDER AND JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL**
Defendant.)
)

On April 4, 2022, Plaintiff, a California resident proceeding *pro se*, filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (the “Complaint”). (Dkt. No. 1.) The Complaint is a single page suing Defendant Proland Management concerning a writ of attachment imposed on an asset of Plaintiff’s, as well as Plaintiff having a “low income or Section 8 apartment [application] den[i]ed . . .” (*Id.*)

At the outset, the Complaint fails to describe what specific acts on the part of Defendant constituted unconstitutional conduct. The Complaint, therefore, violates Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and is subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8; *see also Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (Rule 8 “demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me

1 accusation" and a complaint is insufficient under Rule 8 "if it tenders 'naked assertion[s]'
2 devoid of 'further factual enhancement.'"') (citation omitted).

3
4 Moreover, on April 6, 2022, the Court notified Plaintiff that Plaintiff had failed to pay
5 the filing fee and had not filed a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. No. 2.) On April
6 18, 2022, 12 days after the Court notified Plaintiff about the filing fee without a response from
7 Plaintiff, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause, no later than May 9, 2022, why the action
8 should not be dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee or obtain authorization to proceed
9 without prepayment of the fee ("OSC"). (Dkt. No. 4.) The Court also expressly warned
10 Plaintiff that his failure to timely comply with the OSC "will result in a recommendation of
11 dismissal of this case." (*Id.* at 2.)


12
13 It has now been well over a month since the Court first notified Plaintiff that he had not
14 paid the filing fee. (Dkt. No. 2.) To date, Plaintiff has not responded to the OSC, paid the
15 filing fee, requested to proceed *in forma pauperis*, or made any contact with the Court since
16 filing the Complaint. In light of the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND
17 ADJUDGED that this action is DISMISSED.

18
19 DATED: May 24, 2022



20
21 GEORGE H. WU
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24

Presented by:



25
26 KAREN L. STEVENSON
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28